



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

PATENT

In re patent application of: KEZUKA et al.

Serial No.: 09/856,358

Filed: 22 May 2001

For: ETCHING SOLUTION, ETCHED ARTICLE AND
METHOD FOR ETCHED ARTICLE

Examiner:

Art Unit: 1746

Docket #: P07223US00/BAS

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231

SIR:

Attached is:

- a response after Final Rejection dated
- ☒ a response to the Office Action dated September 24, 2002
- a Preliminary Amendment
- ☒ a Petition for an extension of time
- Other:

RECEIVED
FEB 28 2003
TO 1700 MAIL ROOM

Fees: For claims if required and/or other fees as shown below:

	NOW	Previously Paid For	Present Extra	Rate	\$
TOTAL CLAIMS				X \$ 18 =	
INDEP. CLAIMS				X \$ 84 =	
TOTAL OF ABOVE CLAIMS FEES =					
Reduction by ½ for small entity status of applicant					
SUBTOTAL =					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee for extension of time (per attached Petition)					410.00
Other fee for					
TOTAL OF ALL FEES =					\$410.00

☒ A check in the amount of \$ 410.00 is enclosed. If no check or an insufficient check is enclosed and a fee is due in connection herewith, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee or additional fee due in connection herewith to Deposit Account No. 12-0555.

☒ In the event that a petition for extension of time is required to be submitted herewith and that a separate petition is not submitted herewith, applicant hereby petitions under 37 CFR 1.136(a) for an extension of time of as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee is authorized above.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 24 February 2003

By: 
Registration No.: 31,877

LARSON & TAYLOR, PLC • 1199 North Fairfax St. • Suite 900 • Alexandria, VA 22314



#6
1A
3/3/03
Patent

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re patent application of: KEZUKA et al.

Serial No.: 09/856,358

Examiner:

Filed: 22 May 2001

Art Unit: 1746

For: ETCHING SOLUTION, ETCHED ARTICLE AND
METHOD FOR ETCHED ARTICLE

Docket #: P07223US00/BAS

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Honorable Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D. C.

S I R:

In response to the Official Action dated September 24, 2002, Applicants respond
as follows:

RECEIVED
FEB 28 2003
TC 1700 MAIL ROOM

REMARKS

In the Official Action, there was a reference to the preliminary amendment filed on May 22, 2001, a copy of which is attached hereto. As is clear from the amendment, the amendment was made with regard to Claim 15 and not Claim 14. It is presumed that the amendment to Claim 15 was entered, but if not, Applicants request that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney to discuss the status of this claim.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Li patent, US 5,783,495. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons as stated below.

The Li et al reference cited by the Examiner in fact does not anticipate or make obvious the present claims. To the contrary, Li et al. merely provides a cleaning solution with an etch selectivity ratio of less than 4:1 (preferably 2:1, moreover 0.5:1) for a doped/deposited oxide:thermal/native oxide etch (see, column 4, lines 48-56 of Li et